

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,195	03/01/2000		Allen W Stichter	STICHTER 3	3419
32361	7590	10/29/2004		EXAMINER	
		URIG, LLP	GHULAMALI, QUTBUDDIN		
885 3RD AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2637	

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary	09/516,195	STICHTER, ALLEN W					
Onice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
TI MAII INO DATE ef this assessmin discussion	Qutub Ghulamali	2637					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was properly to the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/23	<u>3/2004</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.						
,— ,,							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	:х рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>53-56</u> is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,13-19,25-29,35-43,46 47and 48</u> is 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-12,21-24 and 30-34, 44, 45 49-52</u> is 	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is ol	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5] Notice of Informal 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/516,195 Page 2

Art Unit: 2637

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment

- 1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 10/23/2003.
- 2. The examiner acknowledges amendment to the Abstract
- 3. The deficiency under 35 U.S. C. 112, second paragraph pertaining to claims 1 and 43 cited in paper No. 5 has been overcome by the applicant's stated clarification and explanation. The rejection, therefore, has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-7, 13, 14-16, 17, 18-20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 37, 39, 43, 46, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Read et al ("Read") (US Patent No. 6,236,623).

Consider claims 1, 13, 14-16, 17, 20, 25-28, 37, 43, 46 and 48, Read substantially discloses (fig. 2) every feature of the claimed invention: a synchronization of clocks in a plurality of devices connected by a communication channel, a master control device 12 having a first clock is coupled to one or more slave control 14 devices having a second clock, sending a first message from the master clock 12 to the slave control 14 comprising a first transit time T₁ of (Tp₁+Tc₁), receiving a second message from the clock slave 14 the second message comprising a

Application/Control Number: 09/516,195

Art Unit: 2637

Page 3

second transit time T₂ of (Tp₂+Tc₂), obtaining a second transit time T₂ at the clock slave 14 a second transmit (reception) time of the second message, calculating a transmission delay (loop communication delay) between the clock slave and clock master from the first and second reception times (Tc₁, Tc₂) and the first and second transmission times (Tp₁, Tp₂), the total loop communication delay is monitored in reference to the master clock circuitry 18 and/or the master time 22 and measured (calculated), essentially the delays are identical in both directions across the communication path 16 (from master to slave or from slave to the master), the loop communication delay (T_1+T_2) is divided by 2 to compute an average delay, and applying the average delay to compensate for the known time setting errors for each of the slave clocks, a slave communication controller is responsive to a synchronization signal sent from the master control device across the communication channel, used in conjunction with an associated time delay value in the offset register, to cause the slave time to essentially synchronize with the master time (col. 2, lines 43-62; col. 5, lines 37-67 and col. 6, lines 20-55), wherein the controller is a programmed processor (microcomputer) (col. 1, lines 55-60). The disclosure in Read however, is directed to a method for synchronizing the clocks of a plurality of slave devices by the master control device. The synchronization could equally be applied by the slave to the clock master as disclosed by Read and since the communication is bi-directional with delays that are essentially identical in both directions across the communication path 16, synchronization between the clock master and the clock slave is achieved by periodic commands from the master control device 12 to the slave which can equally be applied. Given that, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to allow slave to control the master clock so as to achieve synchronization between clocks as disclosed by Read.

Application/Control Number: 09/516,195 Page 4

Art Unit: 2637

Regarding claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 18 and 29, Read discloses, depending upon the number of slave devices 14, the interrogation of each slave device can occur multiple times within a predefined one second interval (col. 7, lines 20-23).

Regarding claims 3, 4, and 19, Read discloses synchronizing the slave clock to the master clock using stored (accumulated) delay (col. 7, lines 4-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 35, 36, 38, 40-42, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Read et al ("Read") (US Patent No. 6,236,623) in view of Lundh et al ("Lundh") (US Patent 6,373,834).

As shown in figures 1, 6A-C, 11A-C, 12 and 13, Read teaches clock synchronization, in a telecommunication network 20, between a master timing (clock) unit and a slave timing (clock) unit located at e.g., base station 22 of the network, performing synchronization analysis to determine a synchronization adjustment value for the slave timing unit, with the master timing unit located in a control node such as a RNC (col. 4, lines 34-36), determines whether the addressed slave timing unit respond within a predetermined time-out window, response messages with the best (lowest) round-trip delay time one having median or average values chosen for the

Art Unit: 2637

subsequent computations (col. 13, lines 27-29 and col. 14, lines 34-42). See also column 3, lines 15-67 and column 4, lines 1-14, col. 8, lines 13-18). Read however, makes no reference to employing the CDMA telecommunications system within the network. Lundh, discloses employing the CDMA telecommunications network system for facilitating an accurate and reliable technique for synchronization of clock timing units, such as timing units at base stations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Read's clock synchronization communications system by employing the CDMA telecommunications within the network so as to provide reliable synchronization of clocks as taught by Lundh.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 53-56 allowed.
- 9. Claims 8-12, 21-24, 30-34, 44, 45, 49-52, are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/2004 with respect to claims 1-7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18-20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 37, 46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The rejection is as follows:

In response to applicant's argument with reference to claims 1-7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18-20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 37, 46, discussed above with reference to 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/516,195

Art Unit: 2637

respectfully would like to draw applicant's attention to fig. 5, that shows a timing diagram for the process of interrogating and synchronizing the slave control devices 14, this process as disclosed by Read, is repeated at a periodic cycle rate for example 5 seconds in response to the fixed frequency output 20, typically a 1 Hz clock from the master clock circuitry 18, in a first portion 56 (comprised of 4 one second intervals) of this process cycle 58 beginning at T₀, interrogation occurs to determine the transit time delay for each slave control device 14 and depending upon the number of slave control devices 14, and the duration of the interrogation cycle portion 56, the interrogation of each slave control device 14 can occur *multiple times* within each one second interval, the master control device 12 preferably averages the calculated transit time delay 48, using a weighted average, the master control device 12 discards any transit time delay values that are significantly different from the calculated average to achieve

Conclusion

synchronization between the master and the slave devices.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qutub Ghulamali whose telephone number is (571) 272-3014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/516,195

Art Unit: 2637

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QG. October 5, 2004.

TEMESGHEN GHEBRETINSAE

10)28/04